These minutes were approved at the Planning Commission meeting of 03-20-13.

MINUTES OF THE ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE PLANNING COMMISSION

February 13, 2013 @ 6:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers
100 Avenida Presidio
San Clemente, CA 92672

---

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Avera called the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of San Clemente to order at 6:03 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Crandell led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present:	Nesa Anderson, Barton Crandell, Michael Kaupp and Jim Ruehlin; Chair pro Tem Donald Brown, Chairman Lew Avera
Commissioners Absent:	Vice Chair Julia Darden
Staff Present:	Jim Pechous, City Planner Jeff Hook, Principal Planner Bill Cameron, City Engineer Thomas Frank, Transportation Engineering Manager Eileen White, Recording Secretary

4. SPECIAL ORDERS OF BUSINESS - None

5. MINUTES - None

6. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS - None

7. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS - None

8. CONSENT CALENDAR - None

9. PUBLIC HEARING - None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. OLD BUSINESS

A. Draft General Plan Mobility and Complete Streets Element and Technical Background Documents (Hook)

This Element addresses the full range of transportation modes, including pedestrian, bicycle, motor vehicle, rail and public transportation. It addresses the general distribution, location and design of public streets, sidewalks, public parking, and other public areas used for public mobility purposes. It also addresses transportation programs, planning and improvements and includes policies and implementation measures to guide transportation changes and meet community needs. The Technical Background Report, which provides data and evaluation of our current transportation facilities, will also be reviewed and discussed.

Jeff Hook reviewed the staff report and provided a General Plan update. Staff and the consultants have developed 12 questions for the Commissioners' consideration. In addition, the Commissioners are tasked with reviewing the element and providing input. Following staff's review of the environmental impact study, the study will be presented to the public for comment. The Commission will have the opportunity to review and comment on the final draft of the draft General Plan before it is presented to City Council for consideration and action.

Chair Avera invited the public to provide comment.

Brenda Miller, resident and member of PEDal, a bicycle transportation advocacy group, recommended the City consider assigning LOS E to all its intersections. She stated this would not worsen traffic, but would improve traffic overall by more easily accommodating alternative forms of non-motorized traffic in the public right of way. A proposal to construct a Class II bike route on Pacific Coast Highway between Estacion and Pico was denied because it would reduce the level of service at Pico and El Camino Real. Current road conditions force bicyclists to occupy the far right lane, which can impede traffic. Reducing intersections to LOS E will increase safety for all. If motor vehicle movement is prioritized over all, traffic will only get worse until intersection changes are made.

A) Review Key Transportation Questions

1. Support an FAR increase in the Rancho San Clemente Business Park? **No, the Commission did not support an increased FAR in the Business Park due to negative traffic congestion impacts it was projected to cause.**

2. Support a lowering of level of service to LOS E or better at four on/off ramp intersections near I-5? **Yes, the Commission supported a lowering of LOS E or better at four on/off ramp intersections near I-5.**

   In response to questions, Bill Cameron, City Engineer, commented it would be premature to arbitrarily change LOS's without understanding potential impacts; advised the City can consider acquiring more right of way along roadways for improvements; noted other options have not yet been explored; recommended the Commission continue existing LOS levels, and consider changing in the future when more is known about multimodal traffic and/or it becomes necessary.

   Commissioners established from staff that one of the policies in the Roadway System section of the Draft Mobility Element provides for future capacity if necessary; stressed that allowing LOS E service at these four intersections does not mean it will happen, but allows flexibility in the future if fully evaluated and determined necessary to address multimodal transportation needs or address design constraints.

3. Allow a blanket reduction Citywide from LOS D to LOS E? **The Commission did not support a "blanket", City-wide reduction from LOS D to LOS E.**

   Commissioners concurred with staff that allowing a blanket reduction may increase traffic congestion, which residents have repeatedly opposed in surveys; commented that with the proposed policy changes, flexibility would exist to allow intersection reductions to LOS E, where necessary.

4. Eliminate the consideration of roadway segment LOS in analyzing traffic impacts and levels of service on City streets? **Yes, the Commission agreed that consideration of roadway segment LOS in analyzing traffic impacts is not a reliable measure for evaluation purposes.**

5. Support inclusion of road diets in the General Plan for further evaluation and possible implementation? **Yes, the Commission agreed to support inclusion of road diets for further study.**

6. Identify the Tesoro Extension of the Foothill Transportation Corridor as part of the City's anticipated transportation network? **Yes, the**

Commission agreed to include the Tesoro Extension of the Foothill Transportation Corridor as part of the City's anticipated transportation network.

7. Support language to allow a more balanced transportation policy language to be consistent with broad General Plan goals of environmental quality, economic vitality, quality of life and reduced traffic congestion? **Yes, the Commission agreed to support a policy similar to the City of Newport Beach's "Shoulder Season" policy, which primarily looks at residential needs as a main determinant for setting LOS or determining needed traffic improvements.**

8. Should the Draft Mobility Element include the revised Introductory Statement as noted in Attachment 7? **Yes, the Draft Mobility Element should include staff's version of the revised Introductory Statement, by Brenda Miller.**

9. Include modal share shift objectives in Mobility Element? **Yes, include modal share shift objectives in Mobility Element for purposes of setting reasonable objectives, help make findings for capital improvements, increase eligibility for grant funds.**

10. Include electric **Yes, include electric vehicle parking and charging provisions in Mobility Element.**

11. Update engineering standards to reflect new General Plan policies? **Yes, update engineering standards to reflect new General Plan policies.**

12. Address truck routes and bicycle parking requirements in the Mobility Element? **Yes, address truck routes and bicycle parking requirements in the Mobility Element, with understanding that policy could potentially reduce number of required automobile parking spaces if more than the minimum required number of alternative parking spaces (e.g. bicycle or electric vehicle parking) are provided.**

B) Review of Draft Mobility and Complete Streets Element

Public Comment:

Brenda Miller encouraged the Commission to adopt a Mobility Element that addresses the needs of and accommodates all modes of transportation.

Following discussion, Commissions provided commentary/suggested revision as follows:

1. Page 1, approved Brenda Miller's introduction, as revised by staff, for the introductory paragraphs.
2. Under "Primary Goal" insert "commercial centers" following "homes," and insert "medical facilities" following "schools"
3. Under "Secondary Goals", no. 5, following "non-significance" insert "pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)"
4. Page 2, No. 7, replace "Orange County, Cal Trans" with "The County of Orange, OCTA, and The California Department of Transportation"
5. Include links to legislation and the Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan.

Roadway System

Public Comment:

Brenda Miller referenced Caltrans Deputy Directive 64, which requires Caltrans to accommodate all users of the roadway system in the design process, and suggested the Commission add this policy as a link in this element.

Commissioners established from staff that although the City contracted for the design of the Vista Hermosa I-5 Interchange, sensitivity to bicycle safety is much higher than previous; agreed new policy C-1.1.f would provide more involvement in safety design for the City; established from staff that Caltrans both constructs and maintains freeway sound attenuation walls.

Following discussion, Commissions provided commentary/suggested revision as follows:

6. Page 3, Under "Goal", replace "A transportation" with "Create a balanced transportation"
7. Under "Policies" C-1.1.a, insert "motor vehicles," in front of "bicyclists"
8. C-1.1.b, following "design" insert "safety"
9. C-1.1.f new policy as follows: "Ensure that new roadways, ramps, bridges, or similar facilities, and significant changes to such facilities, are designed to safely accommodate multimodal facilities, and where feasible, retrofit existing facilities for safety."
10. Page 4, C-1.8, replace "roadway" with "transportation"; add to the end of the sentence (unstrike) "such as interchange improvements along I-5, the extension of the SR 241, and other major freeway and arterial improvements."
11. C-1.10, insert "and sound" after "retaining"
12. Page 5, C-1.16.b, insert "of" following "maintenance"
13. Replace C-1.17. with the following: "*Traffic Calming*. In serving new development or in retrofitting existing streets, we design the Circulation

system, where feasible, to control traffic speed and increase safety in all residential neighborhoods, in accordance with the City's street design standards and traffic calming manual."

14. Page 7, consultant to add links as follows: "Traffic Calming Manual, Living Streets Manual, City Street Design Standards, State Deputy Directive 64, etc."

Non-Automotive Transportation System

Following discussion, Commissions provided commentary/suggested revision as follows:

15. Page 8, Staff/consultant to reconcile policies with Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP)
16. Include NEV policy (per Cheryl Moe) in this section.
17. Policy C-2.1 insert "and pedestrian" following "comprehensive bicycle"
18. Page 9, C-2.10 insert "*Facility*" between "*Bicycle*" and "*Design*"
19. C.2-18. Insert "appropriate to scale of development" after "capital improvement projects"
20. Consultant and staff to ensure that all of C-2.18 is consistent with the BPMP.
21. Page 10, C-2-23, following "bus service" insert "and encourage transit service enhancements"; replace "ensure that all" with "ensure all"; add " Consultant to address trolley and "shuttle" service if not addressed elsewhere."

Safety

Following discussion, Commissions provided commentary/suggested revision as follows:

22. Page 11, introductory paragraph, replace "non-motorized" with "multimodal"
23. Under "Goal" replace "A transportation" with "Create a balanced transportation"
24. C-3.5, following encourage, insert ",assign high priority to"

Parking

Following discussion, Commissions provided commentary/suggested revision as follows:

25. Page 12, under "Goal" replace "A parking" with "Create a parking"

26. C-4.4, add to the end of the sentence, "such as use of energy saving/generating features, demand-based parking strategies, stacking, alternative paving, accommodating multiple uses, and parking elevators.
27. Insert new policy C-4.5, as follows: "*Parking requirements*. We support evaluation and possible consolidation of parking requirements to facilitate transition of land uses and simplify standards."
28. Insert new policy C-4.6, as follows: "*Alternative Parking Requirements and Incentives.* "We will consider incentives to encourage alternative parking such as crediting bicycle, NEV, motorcycle, and scooter parking spaces in meeting a portion of required automobile parking."
29. Consultant to include policy to support development of a comprehensive parking strategy in key commercial areas, including North Beach, Pier Bowl, Downtown, T-Zone, Plaza San Clemente, if not already addressed in another Element.
30. Under "Links to other General Plan Content," add "Local Parking Maps, applications, other programs."

Freight Movement

Public Comment:

Richard Boyer, resident, described strict regulations that regulate the movement of hazardous materials throughout the State; suggested the City consider asking to be notified when hazardous materials will be traveling through the City.

Following discussion, Commissions provided commentary/suggested revision as follows:

31. Page 13, C-5.4, replace with "*Parking, Delivery hours and Loading*. We will consider establishing standard which direct commercial deliveries during off-peak periods to limit freight impacts on parking and other modes of travel and to regulate delivery hours and loading locations to minimize noise impacts to adjacent residential uses."
32. C-5.5, staff to follow up with Jenn Tucker, the City's Emergency Planning Officer, for clarification.

Circulation Implementation Measures

Public Comment:

Brenda Miller suggested that implementing the intersection improvements listed in no. 6 will drastically change the City.

Richard Boyer, resident, listed the innovative policies put in place by the City of Long Beach to improve its streets for bicyclists; endorsed the possible creation of a Mobility and Complete Streets committee/commission for grant funding purposes; recommended the City adopt LOS E for all intersections while street changes are being made.

Following discussion, Commissions provided commentary/suggested revision as follows:

33. Page 1 no. 2, replace "Committee" with "Committee/Commission"
34. No. 6, replace "Implement the following" with "If necessary to mitigate potential impacts, the City will implement the following"
35. Page 15, no. 7, following facilities, insert "as appropriate to scale of project"
36. No. 8, replace "develop" with "Working with other agencies, the City will seek grants to help develop"
37. No. 10, consultant to make sure there's a policy to support this measure.
38. No. 11, replace "Develop" with "Validate"
39. No. 12, following "designation areas" insert "including, but not limited to"
40. No. 12, Consultant to verify policy basis for this measure.
41. New measure no. 14, as follows, "Include measure addressing Item 3, from Tom Franks 1-16-13 memo."

12. REPORTS OF COMMISSIONERS/STAFF - None

13. ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY COMMISSIONER KAUPP, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RUEHLIN, AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED to adjourn at 10:44 p.m. to the Adjourned Regular Planning Commission Meeting to be held at 6:00 p.m. on February 20, 2013 in Council Chambers at City Hall located at 100 Avenida Presidio, San Clemente, CA.

Respectfully submitted,

Lew Avera, Chair

Attest:

Jim Pechous, City Planner